

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 remain pending. Applicant has amended claims 1-5. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 32, lines 1-5, 15-21; page 33, lines 1-25; and page 34, lines 1-6.

In the Final Office Action mailed on February 28, 2006, the Examiner responded to Applicant's arguments presented in the Response filed on November 18, 2005; rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; and rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,714,797 to Rautila (*"Rautila"*).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In rejecting claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner alleges "[t]he claims have been amended to now include supporting a preview of the retrieved content, however, no support for this new limitation has been found in the Applicant's specification" (Final Office Action at 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended claims 1 and 3-5 now recite in-part "supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after inputting the identification code." Amended claim 2 now recites in-part "supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after supplying the identification code." Applicant's original specification discloses that when a user inputs an ID code into the store terminal, "the corresponding music name and artist name are retrieved and displayed in the display section H2" (Specification, p. 33, lines 5-8). In addition, "[c]oncerning music displayed...a promotion video is displayed and a music file is played" (Specification, p. 34, lines 2-4). "This allows the store terminals 5A to 5N to

prompt each user to recognize the ID code input by the user, so that...mispurchase can be prevented” (Specification, p. 34, lines 22-25). “[R]ecognition by the user of the music is obtained in the above manner. When the BUY item is selected...the music specified by the ID code is downloaded into the memory card 16, as described above” (Specification, p. 35, lines 6-11). Thus, after the user enters the ID code, and before the user buys or downloads the music specified by the ID code, the store terminal provides a preview of the specified music at least in the form of displaying the corresponding music and artist name, displaying the corresponding video, and playing the corresponding music file.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant’s original specification discloses the claim limitation “supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after inputting the identification code,” as recited in each of claims 1 and 3-5. Similarly, Applicant’s original specification discloses “supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after supplying the identification code,” as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Rautila*. To properly establish that a prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in the single prior art reference. Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Rautila* because the reference fails to teach each and every claim

element of the claim. In particular, *Rautila* at least does not disclose “supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after inputting the identification code,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Rautila discloses a system where a “user 20 may browse content titles on the web page in operation 780. Thereafter, in operation 790 the user 20 selects a desired digital product and purchases it” (*Rautila*, column 8, lines 13-15). Once the user has selected and purchased the desired digital product, the user receives a unique order number so the user can download the selected digital product from a hotspot network location (*Rautila*, column 8, lines 13-36). To download the selected and purchased digital product, the user transmits the received unique order number to the hotspot device (*Rautila*, column 6, lines 50-53). In response, the hotspot device transmits to the user a request for confirmation that the user still wants to download the digital product (*Rautila*, column 6, lines 53-57). If the user confirms that he or she still wants to purchase (and download) the digital product, the hotspot device transmits the digital product associated with the unique order number to the user (*Rautila*, column 6, lines 53-64). *Rautila* also discloses “the hotspot network 50 may also transmit advertisements to be shown on [the user’s] display” (*Rautila*, column 6, lines 64-67).

As described above, in *Rautila*, the only events occurring after the user transmits the unique order number to the hotspot device are the user confirmation process and transmitting advertisements to the user’s display. Neither event, however, constitutes “supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code,” as recited in claim 1. The user confirmation process described in *Rautila* merely allows a user to confirm whether he or she still wants to purchase (and download) the

digital product. *Rautila*'s user confirmation process does not teach or suggest that the user receives any information specific to the digital product, let alone "a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code." Similarly, transmitting advertisements to a user's display does not constitute "a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code" because *Rautila* does not disclose the advertisements corresponding to the digital product being downloaded.

Thus, because the only events disclosed in *Rautila* that occur after the user transmits the unique order number are the user confirmation process and transmitting advertisements, and neither constitutes "a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code," *Rautila* fails to teach or suggest "supporting a preview of the retrieved electronic content identified by the identification code after inputting the identification code," as recited in claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over *Rautila*. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to *Rautila*.

While of different scope than claim 1, claims 2-5 recite subject matter similar to that of claim 1 already discussed. Applicant therefore asserts that claims 2-5 are allowable at least for the reasons presented above for claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, placing claims 1-5 in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 25, 2006

By: 
Patrick L. Miller
Reg. No. 57,502